2537 Regent St., Apt. 202
Berkeley, Calif. 94704
November 25, 1968

Harold Weisberg
Route 8
Frederick, Md. 21701

Dear Harold,

Here is my report on my talk with Johann Rush. (Note the last sentence.) I am sending a copy to Rush, but not to N.O. or Turner. I expect you will want to send a copy to N.O. Reports like that are a lot of work; I don't think I would make a good Feebee.

Enclosed: CD 84, pp. 91-2 and CE [redacted] 1536, purportedly page 91. Jim Schmitt suspects Cirello is Civello, a Dallas Mafia name he saw somewhere. (This is unchecked and not for attribution.) Being curious why the report was published at all if it was to be doctored, I checked the major Ruby sections of the Warren Report and found only 1 footnote referring to CE 1536. On page 801, it is one of 12 items cited in a footnote (number 393) to the assertion that Ruby "enjoyed card playing" (!)

Today I received 6 stills from the Rush film from Gary. Very interesting. In our efforts to identify the people pictured, we should keep in mind the possibilty that an FBI agent or other policeman was there. The T-P had a picture of Regis Kennedy (5/18/67, p. 1) but I don't recall seeing one of DeBrueys.

Incidentally, if you are in a position to make the phone call, it might be worthwhile for you to speak to Doyle and Wilson. When they were contacted long ago they were friendly. I think you would be best qualified to persuade them to give up a copy of the film taken by young Doyle.

More enclosures: Rankin to Hoover, 2/20/64, re Hosty-notebook. I have ordered the letter there referred to, Hoover to Rankin 1/27/64. Do you have it? I guess we are to believe that the Commission didn't ask Hoover about this matter until 2/20, although the above-mentioned letter was sent 3 weeks previously and Rankin and Hoover met on 1/28. The delay by Willens (Rankin) conveniently allowed Hoover to testify that the material omitted the first time was sent to the Commission before "any inquiry concerning this matter" by the Commission (5H112). Incidentally, if the material had been properly omitted at first, are we really supposed to believe that it was sent later "in order that there would be a complete reporting of all items in Oswald's notebook"? (5H112) This subsequent report (CD 385, pp. 279-283) is enclosed.

Sincerely,
Paul

Encl: 3 + 1 + (2 + 5) = 11 pp.